

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

1. Addition of New Claims 29-56

Original claims 1-28 have been rewritten as new claims 29-56 to improve the clarity of the subject matter for which protection is sought. The voluntary changes to the claims were provided since it was perceived that some of the language could be improved to more clearly define the inventive subject matter. It is to be noted that the Examiner did not raise any rejections with regard to the language of the original claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 or any other part of the patent laws and regulations related to the presentation of the language in the claims.

The language used in new claims 29-56 closely parallels the language recited in original claims 1-28. However, claim 29 does include a new limitation in view of the recitation in claim 1. More specifically, the new limitation indicates that the control communication sent from the general processing unit to each of the individual processing units is independent from the data stream sent to each processing unit. This limitation is clearly found on page 2, lines 26-35 in the written description of the present application.

GAP U  
CC  
5000

Acceptance of new claims 29-56 is respectfully requested in the next communication from the Examiner.

2. Rejection of claims 1-5, 9, 10, 21, 22 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,097,351 (Nishida)

Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 21, 22 and 25-28 currently stand rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of Nishida. It will be noted that new claims 29-33, 37, 38, 47, 48 and 53-56 directly correspond to canceled claims 1-5, 9, 10, 21, 22 and 25-28 and will thus be addressed in the discussion that follows.

In view of the language used in new claims 29 and 53, as will be discussed below, Applicants submit that the disclosure of Nishida fails to disclose or suggest the basic claimed method recited in claim 29 and the display of claim 53.

It will be noted that claims 29 and 53 each recite that the control communication sent from the general processing unit to each of the individual processing is independent from the data stream sent to each processing unit. Upon a review of the teachings by Nishida, the independence of the control communication from the data stream appears not to be taught. More specifically, Nishida discloses transmitting display signals from the control device to respective display units and such display signals contain both data information and address information (col. 7, lines 25-28).

Next, in accordance with claim 47, the display elements of the display device of the present application are current driven. On the other hand, the display elements of Nishida are voltage driven (col. 9, lines 29-63).

Claim 48 recites that in the display device of the present application, the drive current can be adjusted in order to adjust the brightness and thus the contrast of the display. Contrariwise, in the display device described by Nishida, the power can be switched on or off, and accordingly, the adjustment of the brightness of the display is not possible.

In view of the above observations, Applicants submit that claims 30-33, 37 and 38, which either depend directly or indirectly from claim 29, are thus patentable based on their dependency from claim 29 and their individually recited features.

Claims 54-56, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 53, are thus patentable based on their dependency from claim 53 and their individually recited features.

Thus, in view of the observations on claims new claims 29-33, 37, 38, 47, 48 and 53-56 and the disclosure of Nishida, it is readily evident that Nishida does not disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 29-33, 37, 38, 47, 48 and 53-56 of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,005,557 (Wong)

Claims 23 and 24 currently stand rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of Wong. It will be noted that new claims 51 and 52 directly correspond to canceled claims 23 and 24, and will thus be addressed in the discussion that follows.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that Wong fails to disclose or suggest each and every step or feature in the method recited new claims 51 and 52.

As described in both claims 51 and 52, the image stabilization is recited as being "dynamic." Applicants attribute the ordinary and plain meaning of dynamic as being marked by continuous and productive activity or change (WEBSTER'S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, Tenth Edition). Contrary to applying a "dynamic" image stabilization as recited in claim 51, the disclosure of Wong describes quite plainly that the image stabilization method described therein includes enabling a user to intervene in the display of an image and stabilization. Such intervention is achieved by adjusting both pixel clock pulses and the synchronization of the display panel simultaneously (col. 2, lines 27-39).

In the Action, the Examiner has provided language recited in claim 1 of the patent granted to Wong. It will be noted that claim 1, as with the entire disclosure of

Wong, recites that a control device is "manually" adjusted. This step in the method of Wong is followed by additional limitations which describe how the control device may be manually adjusted to provide for image stabilization. Such steps recited in the disclosure of Wong clearly do not result in "dynamic" image stabilization. Accordingly, the disclosure of Wong fails to disclose or suggest the basic method of claim 51.

*No where does Wong teach manually adjusting image stabilization*

Claim 52 is thus patentable based on its dependency from claim 51 and its individually recited features regarding techniques which may be used to provide dynamic image stabilization.

In view of the observations on the disclosure of Wong in view of new claims 51 and 52, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

4. Rejection of claims 6-8 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,097,351 (Nishida) in view of U.S. Patent 5,396,257 (Someya et al.)

Claims 6-8 and 11-16 currently stand rejected as being obvious over the disclosures of Nishida and Someya et al. It will be noted that new claims 34-36 and 39-44 directly correspond to canceled claims 6-8 and 11-16. Claims 34-36 and 39-44, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 29, are patentable based on their dependency from claim 29 and their individually recited steps or features.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that the disclosure of Someya et al. fails to overcome the basic shortcomings in the teachings of Nishida, as detailed above in reference to claim 29.

In specific reference to claim 34, it will be pointed out that neither Someya et al. nor Nishida disclose a method including individual adjustments such as "dynamic sample weight distribution," corrective adjustments in function of temperature and/or age, transfer function adjustments or enlargements of incoming video signal.

In specific reference to claims 39 and 40, it will be noted that neither Someya et al. nor Nishida disclose or suggest a frequency independent operation of every display unit which may be achieved by realizing an automatic pulse width adjustment and/or by carrying out a frequency raise. On the contrary, Someya et al. merely describes that the comparison circuit 102, the contrast control circuit 88, and the luminance circuit 89 are completely separated from the minimum value circuit 90, the ABL circuit 114 and the contrast and or luminance control circuit 111. Moreover, it is described that a switching pulse is a control pulse synchronized preferably with a falling edge of a horizontal synchronizing pulse and has a pulse width T wherein the switching pulse controls the input signal of the contrast and/or luminance circuit 111.

Accordingly, it is readily evident that a major difference exists between the frequency independent operation recited in the present application and the independent operation described in the disclosure of Someya et al.

In specific reference to claims 41-44, Nishida describes that signal processing occurs at both the control device and the display units. Moreover, Someya et al. describe how a display screen can be divided into parts in order to achieve a resolution display. Neither disclosure of Nishida nor Someya et al. discloses or suggests raising the frequency in individual processing units, raising the line frequency in a general processing unit, and distributed signal processing for signals which determine the image geometry.

Accordingly, the disclosures of Nishida and Someya et al., whether considered collectively or individually, fail to disclose or suggest the basic method of claim 29 of the present application. Claims 34-36 and 39-44 are thus allowable in view of the disclosures of Nishida and Someya et al. Withdrawal of this rejection therefore requested.

5. Rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,097,351 (Nishida) in view of U.S. Patent 6,005,557 (Wong)

Claims 17-20 currently stand rejected as being obvious over the disclosures of Nishida and Wong. It will be noted that new claims 45-48 directly correspond to canceled claims 17-20. Claims 45-48, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 29, are patentable based on their dependency from claim 29 and their individually recited steps or features.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that the disclosure of Wong fails to overcome the basic shortcomings in the teachings of Nishida, as detailed above in reference to claim 29.

As noted above, Applicants submit that Wong fails to disclose or suggest the "dynamic" image stabilization of the present application, as specifically recited in new claims 45 and 46.

In specific reference to claims 47 and 48, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion provided in either of the disclosures of Wong and Nishida that would motivate one skilled in the art to provide individual processing units with a master clock correction. It will be noted that the dot\_clk signal disclosed in Wong is provided for the entire image display stabilization apparatus and not for individual processing units. Moreover, the dot\_clk signal is described as being adjusted manually by the user (col. 5, lines 11-21), and is therefore not "dynamic."

In view of the comments in the Action, it appears that it is proposed that the disclosures of Wong and Nishida suggest the desirability to provide each of the individual processing units with a manually adjustable master clock. Such a combination is obviously different from the master clock correction for each of individual processing units recited in claims 47 and 48 of the present application.

Application No.: 09/926,408  
Examiner: Uchendu O. ANYASO  
Art Unit: 2675

Accordingly, in view of these observations, Applicants courteously submit that new claims 45-48 would not be obvious in view of the disclosures of Nishida and Wong, whether considered collectively or individually. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 09/926,408  
Examiner: Uchendu O. ANYASO  
Art Unit: 2675

6. Conclusion

In view of new claims 29-56, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 29-56 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicants' Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: March 3, 2004

amendment 020304.wpd

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Justin J. Cassell', written over a horizontal line.

JUSTIN J. CASSELL  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,205